



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,595	08/25/2003	Richard Harvey	063170.6609	4259

5073 7590 05/16/2008  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
2001 ROSS AVENUE  
SUITE 600  
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER
----------

LEWIS, ALICIA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

05/16/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com  
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/648,595	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HARVEY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Alicia M. Lewis	<b>Art Unit</b> 2164	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/2/2008, 2/15/2008, and 12/14/2007</u> .                     | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |



### DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to communication filed February 15, 2008.

Claims 1, 8, 18 and 20 are currently amended. Therefore, claims 1-20 remain pending in this application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) (*current application filing date 8/26/2002*) as being unpatentable over Elmore et al (US 2006/0059107 A1, *priority date 3/30/2001*) in view of Gadbois et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0002955 A1, *filing date 6/28/2002*) ('Gadbois'), and further in view of Moran et al (US 2008/0109897 A1, *priority date 7/12/2001*) ('Moran').

With respect to claims 1 and 8, Elmore teaches:

arranging user object(s) under a repository layer comprising one or more repository objects collectively forming a prefix, each user object representing a web services account (elements 462 and 463 in Figure 19, paragraph 626; and element 491 and 492 in Figure 21, paragraph 976-978);

arranging business entity object(s) under user object(s) (elements 467 and 468 in Figure 19, paragraph 626; and element 493 in Figure 21, paragraph 976); and

receiving a request to modify an object from a user (Figure 9, paragraphs 194, 195 and 518).

Elmore does not teach arranging corresponding tModel object(s) under at least one of user object(s), repository object and prefix.

Gadbois teaches information model mapping with shared directory tree representations (see abstract), in which he teaches arranging corresponding tModel object(s) under at least one of user object(s), repository object and prefix (paragraph 39).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Elmore by the teaching of Gadbois because arranging corresponding tModel object(s) under at least one of user object(s), repository object and prefix would enable an efficient means of recording and publishing assertions regarding business organization relationships (peer-to-peer, parent-subsidiary, etc.) by different business organizations or their authorized publishing entities and an efficient means of managing publisher assertions (Gadbois, paragraph 4).

Further regarding claims 1 and 8, Elmore in view of Gadbois does not teach matching a distinguishes name associated with the user and at least a portion of the distinguished name associated with the object; providing the user access to the object

in response to matching the distinguished name associated with the object and the distinguished name associated with the user; and modifying the object as requested by the user in response to the user accessing the object.

Moran teaches grouped access control list actions (see abstract), in which he teaches:

receiving a request to modify an object from a user (paragraph 46);

matching a distinguished name associated with the user and at least a portion of the distinguished name associated with the object (paragraph 115);

providing the user access to the object in response to matching the distinguished name associated with the object and the distinguished name associated with the user (paragraph 115); and

modifying the object as requested by the user in response to the user accessing the object (paragraphs 46 and 115).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Elmore by the teaching of Moran because matching a distinguished name associated with the user and at least a portion of the distinguished name associated with the object; providing the user access to the object in response to matching the distinguished name associated with the object and the distinguished name associated with the user; and modifying the object as requested by the user in response to the user accessing the object would enable the use of access control lists to describe permissions on protected systems and networks to access

Art Unit: 2164

resources and objects associated with clients, thus providing a more secure, protected system.

With respect to claims 2 and 9, Elmore as modified teaches arranging publisher assertion object(s) under business entity object(s) (Gadbois, elements 222, 224, 252, 254, 282 and 284 in Figure 2, paragraphs 28-29).

With respect to claims 3 and 10, Elmore as modified teaches further comprising providing service projection object(s) under business entity object(s) (Gadbois, elements 222, 224, 242, 243, 244, 272 and 274 in Figure 2, paragraph 28).

With respect to claims 4 and 11, Elmore as modified teaches wherein the service projection object(s) is implemented as an alias (Gadbois, elements 242, 243, 244, 245 and 246 in Figure 2, paragraphs 28 and 29).

With respect to claims 5 and 12, Elmore as modified teaches further comprising first field(s) as attributes of publisher assertion object(s) (Gadbois, elements 254 and 284 in Figure 2, paragraph 33).

Gadbois teaches that publisher assertion names (PublisherAssertion1 and PublisherAssertion2) and publisher names (Publisher1 and Publisher2) are attributes of publisher assertion object(s).

With respect to claims 6 and 13, Elmore as modified teaches further comprising representing a keyed reference by an auxiliary class (Gadbois, paragraphs 38-39).

Gadbois discloses that a fromKey, toKey, and keyedReference are all included when publisher assertions are added to a directory information tree (DIT). One having ordinary skill in the art recognizes that these included attributes represent an auxiliary class because they are added to publisher assertion objects instances rather than to the entire class of objects.

With respect to claims 7 and 14, Elmore as modified teaches further comprising providing a distinguished name of an object revealing a chain of ownership and control for the object (Gadbois, Figure 2, paragraphs 27-29).

With respect to claims 15 and 16, Elmore as modified teaches storing the arrangement of user objects, one or more repository objects, business entity objects, and tmodel objects in a registry accessible to one or more users of web services (Gadbois, paragraphs 23-25).

With respect to claims 17 and 19, Elmore as modified teaches:

providing a plurality of repository layers distributed on a plurality of servers, each repository layer comprising at least one repository object (Elmore, paragraphs 46 and 978); and



assigning a domain name to each of the plurality of repository layers (Elmore, paragraphs 972 and 973); and

wherein arranging user object(s) under a repository layer comprises arranging user object(s) under each of the repository objects (Elmore, paragraph 978).

3. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elmore et al (US 2006/0059107 A1) in view of Gadbois et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0002955 A1) ('Gadbois') and Moran et al (US 2008/0109897 A1, *priority date 7/12/2001*) ('Moran'), as applied to claims 1-17 and 19 above, and further in view of Grubbs et al. (US 2003/0236956 A1) ('Grubbs').

With respect to claims 18 and 20, Elmore as modified teaches:

providing a plurality of repository layers distributed on a plurality of servers, each repository layer comprising at least one repository object (Elmore, paragraph 46); and the arrangements of user objects, business entities and model objects on a server.

Elmore as modified does not teach logically representing each entry on each server, each entry only stored on a selected one of the plurality of servers.

Grubbs teaches file system backup in a logical volume management data storage environment (see abstract), in which he teaches logically representing each entry on each server, each entry only stored on a selected one of the plurality of servers (paragraphs 24-26).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Elmore by the teaching of Grubbs because logically representing each entry on each server, each entry only stored on a selected one of the plurality of servers would enable capturing a valid point-in-time image of a system using logical volume management, which could further be used for archiving and back-ups (Grubbs, abstract).

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2164

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia M. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 - 6:30, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alicia M Lewis/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2164  
May 9, 2008

/Charles Rones/

Application/Control Number: 10/648,595

Page 10

Art Unit: 2164

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164